

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 09/745,651 Confirmation No.: 1536
Applicant: Glen Kirwin, et al.
Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR PROVIDING A TRADING INTERFACE
Filed: December 22, 2000
Art Unit: 3691
Examiner: Muriel S. Tinkler
Atty. Docket: 99-1013
Customer No. 63710

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, VA 22313-1450

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS AND OTHER DISCUSSIONS

The undersigned spoke with Examiner Tinkler several times regarding the present application.

A telephone interview regarding the present application took place between Examiner Tinkler and the undersigned on March 5, 2010. The pertinent portion of the Examiner's summary of the interview (dated March 15, 2010) is presented here as follows:

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MURIEL TINKLER (3) _____
(2) Chris Agnu (4) _____

Date of Interview: 05 March 2010.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 37-40, 50, 63-69 and 76-99.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative discussed the invention. The Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the claims as currently amended. The Examiner has agreed to meet with the Applicant again to discuss searches that the Examiner has performed and to try to help the Applicant's representative find possible allowable subject matter from the specification and/or dependent claims.

In the Notice of Allowance dated June 9, 2010, the Examiner also referenced the March 5, 2010 interview as follows:

The Examiner has spoken with the Applicant's representative (Chris Agnu) on several occasions concerning this application. More specifically on March 5, 2010, the Applicant's representative and the Examiner had an interview discussion the inventive concept and the differences between this application and the cited prior art.

The undersigned generally agrees with the Examiner's summaries of the telephone interview.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with or acquiesce in any characterization of any claim term, any comment, or any rejection of any claim that the Examiner may have made in the interview summaries or during the pendency of the present patent application.

For example, the undersigned wishes to clarify that Examiner and the undersigned have not met with one another in person and have only had telephone conversations with one another.

During brief telephone conversations on March 9, 2010, and March 11, 2010, the undersigned scheduled a telephone interview with Examiner Tinkler for March 23, 2010.

The scheduled telephone interview regarding the present application took place between Examiner Tinkler and the undersigned on March 23, 2010. The pertinent portion of the Examiner's summary of the interview (from the Notice of Allowance dated June 9, 2010) is presented here as follows:

All Participants:(1) MURIEL TINKLER(2) Chris Agnu**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 23 March 2010**Time:** 5:00 PM**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

37-40, 50, 63-69 and 76-99

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***The Examiner contacted the Applicant's representative to discuss the incorporation of claim 38 into claim 37 in order to more this application toward an allowance. The Applicant's representative agreed.*

Elsewhere in the Notice of Allowance dated June 9, 2010, the Examiner referenced the March 23, 2010 interview as follows:

Additionally, in March 23, 2010, the Examiner and the Applicant's representative had a detailed discussion concerning the claims and amendments to claim 37. Based on these discussions and the amendment to claim 37 (as shown below), it has been determined by the Office that this application is currently in condition for allowance.

The undersigned generally agrees with the Examiner's summaries of the telephone interview.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with or acquiesce in any characterization of any claim term, any comment, or any rejection of any claim that the Examiner may have made in the interview summaries or during the pendency of the present patent application.

Nonetheless, to advance prosecution and obtain early issuance of some subject matter, on March 23, 2010, the undersigned discussed amending the claims with the Examiner, and, on March 25, 2010, following a brief discussion with Examiner Tinkler that day, the undersigned sent a proposed amendment to the Examiner via electronic mail and formally authorized entry of the amendment as an Examiner's Amendment.

The undersigned subsequently received the Notice of Allowance dated June 9, 2010. In the Notice of Allowance, the Examiner noted the following:

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Chris Agnu on March 23, 2010.

The undersigned followed up approval for the Examiner's Amendment with actual proposed amendment language that the undersigned sent to the Examiner on March 25, 2010, as noted above.

The undersigned appreciates Examiner Tinkler's time in speaking with and corresponding with the undersigned regarding the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 19, 2010

By: /Christopher D. Agnew/
Christopher D. Agnew
Reg. No. 43,464
cagnew@cantor.com
(857) 413-2050
Customer No: 63710